

Dear members of the Judiciary Committee:

If indigent citizens do not have access to appeals courts, perhaps that needs fixing; or maybe a wealthy benefactor could help the petitioner; or the state could write a bill granting this individual free access to the courts. It would be less expensive for the state and the costs to individuals on the SOR than changing the laws of the entire state for this one person. (One wonders why the petitioner decided to have babies with this man in the first place, if his character is as bad as she says it is.)

The prosecutor from the Upper Peninsula was right. Punishing people, ("Unfitnesss may be anticipatory in nature.") for what they might do does have historical precedent. The incarceration of Japanese Americans during World War II comes to mind. This was caused by mass hysteria and paranoia in the public. The same hysteria and paranoia caused the establishment of the Sex Offender Registry. Presuming that because someone was convicted or plead guilty to a crime and therefore should be punished for crimes they might do in the future, is against due process and common sense. The framers of the constitution provided protection to citizens from these situations by including due process in the Bill of Rights. Whenever we punish people for crimes we think they are likely to do, we are acting out of fear, not reason. We are violating the protections of the Constitution and the state is thus the entity committing criminal behavior. Handle these kind of situations on a case-by-case basis. Hold people responsible ONLY for what they have done. The state should get out of the fortune-telling, mind-reading business and stop persecuting people. To label whole groups of people as unfit parents as SB 694 does, will not only deprive people of their rights as parents, it also will deprive children of the stable homes and financial support good parenting could be offering a child.

Sincerely,

Lorraine Brooks
1901 Grange
Trenton, MI 48183

734-671-0087